



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8648

VOL. XXXI No. 180 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 10 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virtden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 10 February, 1984.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motions . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 18 students of Grade 9 standing from the Calvin Christian School under the direction of Mr. Folkers. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River East.

There are 30 visitors from the Winnipeg Society of Seniors. They are under the direction of Mr. Tesarski. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this morning.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Sanders, David, status of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

A MEMBER: We want Filmon, we want Filmon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Could the Minister of Urban Affairs confirm that the defeated NDP candidate in River Heights in the last provincial election, Mr. David Sanders, has been given a contract by the Manitoba Government at a salary of \$66,000 per year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Since I forwarded to the Member for Kirkfield Park the contract for Mr. David Sanders, I believe she has that information.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, then could the Minister also confirm that included in the \$66,000 per year salary, which is indexed, he will also receive a government car?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Sanders was the Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs. The contract reflects a Deputy Minister's level, which he was receiving, of salary and car.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister further inform the House whether Mr. Sanders has been

assigned a secretary and an office and how many weeks he will be working for this salary - how many hours a week he will be working for this salary of \$66,000.00?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, this is a full-time job. Mr. Sanders is the only staff assigned to the review of The City of Winnipeg Act, a major undertaking. He is in an office in the Department of Urban Affairs. He does not have his own secretary. There will be provisions made when the Review Committee is appointed for the appropriate support for that Review Committee, so that they can report to the government and we can act upon their recommendations.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, in light of the answer that the Minister has given about a full-time job, why is the government allowing this defeated NDP Government candidate, in addition to the - that's a Freudian slip - in addition to the \$66,000 annually, a free car and other fringe benefits to do outside consulting work? Can she assure the people of Manitoba that he is not using the car and the office to do this outside consulting work?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, what I find curious is a series of questions about this one position, which is really no different than positions that existed under their government or under ours. Mr. Sanders was employed by the former government as well as the present government, so there has been very little change. There is in Manitoba not a restriction upon civil servants for their free time, what they do with their free time. Mr. Sander's contract makes it very clear that he is a full-time employee of the government who will work on his assignments, as assigned by myself and this government full-time. He does not do his consulting work during that time.

Grant, Mr., status of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister, the Honourable Minister of Government Services. An Order-in-Council, awhile back, confirmed the appointment of the defeated candidate in the Minnedosa constituency as a special assistant advising the Department of Government Services at a salary of \$31,100.00. I wonder if the Minister could advise this House where the office is located and what his duties are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand that Mr. Grant has received a nod of approval from the Portage-Marquette constituency, and I hasten to congratulate Mr. Grant on receiving the nomination for the New Democratic Party in Portage-Marquette. I also want to compliment him on the choice of party that he chose to represent.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Grant is not a special assistant, he's an executive assistant and he has his terms - job description. He knows what his responsibilities are and he's doing an excellent job representing me in my constituency, as well as wherever I ask him to be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too congratulate Mr. Grant on getting the NDP nomination in Portage-Marquette, and I can assure you he'll be as thoroughly trounced there as he was in the last provincial election in the Minnedosa constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I still didn't receive an answer on where the office was located. Is he operating out of an office?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Grant does not have a special office. He operates out of his own home at the present time in Minnedosa.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: For a number of years now, Mr. Speaker, municipalities have offered myself free office space to meet with constituents and to conduct government business and we have those offices available to us whenever we require them.

MR. D. BLAKE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That's very enlightening information. I wonder if the Minister could assure the House and the people of Portage-Marquette that Mr. Grant will be campaigning federally on his own time and not on government time when he's a paid employee.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that what Mr. Grant does on his own time, as long as he conducts the job and the things that I ask him to do and request that be done, what he does on his own time is his business, not mine.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition yesterday said that he was ready for a free vote and I quote, "anytime," - anytime, anytime - and in view of the fact that the government has accepted that offer, I would like to ask the Premier whether he or the House Leader has received any further indication from the Leader of the Opposition or the House Leader of the

Opposition as to whether the Leader of the Opposition has been able to convince his caucus to follow his offer which was made publicly in question period yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Thompson for this very important question because we've been awaiting an opportunity to find out whether or not the Leader is in charge of his caucus, or whether his caucus is holding their Leader in captivity. Because, Mr. Speaker, the words, and I have the transcript very clearly now in front of me, "Mr. Speaker," said the Leader yesterday, "I want to assure the First Minister that we will accept a free vote on our side of the House at anytime whether it's today, tomorrow or next week."

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that though he may be a captive of his caucus, though he may be under the control of the hard-liners and the right-wingers in his caucus, if he is indeed not a hard-liner right-winger himself, we are ready to accept, we are ready, and we again repeat, Mr. Speaker, we are ready and we're anxious to accept his offer yesterday to vote, a free vote anytime, whether it's today - that was yesterday, whether it's tomorrow - that's today, or next week. We're ready, we're prepared to accept; we're still waiting. Is the Leader of the Opposition in charge of his caucus or is he being held hostage by his caucus?

MR. S. ASHTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition also said yesterday that he only requested time to call in his members and in view of the fact that one of the members that he was referring to is indeed back today, I was wondering if the Premier, who has not been muzzled by our caucus, might make an offer to the Leader of the Opposition to hold a vote right now on the very important matter before us.

A MEMBER: Sam said to wait until he got back.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me assure . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Let me assure the Member for Thompson, Mr. Speaker, through you, Mr. Speaker, and to the honourable members across the way that, I'm sure, have some reluctance and some uneasiness about pairing, that we give our solemn undertaking on this side of the Chamber, whether it be verbal, by record in this House or by way of writing, that we will honour any pair on this side of the Chamber.

So honourable members need not have any concern, because I note that yesterday the Leader of the Opposition indicated that some time would be required to get his members in for the vote. We're prepared to provide ample time or even better, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to provide pairing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether or not the Leader of the Opposition is captive, or whether he's attempting to weasel out of a commitment that he made yesterday in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the First Minister should be aware of the rules that . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Resign, Gary, if you can't keep to your word.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the First Minister was rising to respond to a question placed on the floor by the Member for Thompson, and it is for him to answer those questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Get up and say that Howard.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Frank, your word means nothing.

Children's Aid Society - Winnipeg

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Community Services. The Minister is organizing and regionalizing the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg into six new agencies. Have any elections been held as yet to establish boards in these six areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: No, Mr. Speaker. The nominating committee has been appointed and is busily sorting out the nominations received, and as of February 15th, the submissions will effectively be terminated. The sorting then will occur and the actual elections will be

called as soon as we can get them under way. We're targeting for the mid-March period.

MR. A. BROWN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are all six of these boards to proceed simultaneously with their responsibilities?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there will be a slight staggering of dates but the actual sorting out of cases and gradual devolution to the boards will be proceeding in parallel. There may be slight variations of a week or so in terms of their progress to deal with the local conditions, but effectively they will all be proceeding in parallel.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: My next question is: when does the Minister expect that these boards are going to be operational?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, they will be gearing up once they have been elected. Their first task will be to start selecting executive directors. There will be orientation programs for the boards. They will then be proceeding to start sorting out the cases, looking for alternate locations in the areas. We will, within a few days now, be presenting to the people interested, an outline of the plan and further issues for open discussion, but the sequence of events has been identified and it's a question of working them out in an orderly and systematic way within each region.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister tell me what is the time schedule for the breaking up of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is an interim board in place running the Children's Aid of Winnipeg at the current time. That board will stay in place, along with an expanded implementation committee with representation from the different regions, to supervise the total transfer. They will not cease to function until the reorganization is complete and the duties are all transferred, as I say, in an orderly fashion to the regions.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister tell me if any services will be kept centralized, for instance, adoption and child abuse are specialties, and how will these be handled?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is our expectation that some of those services will need co-ordination. The discussion paper and the overall plan that I mentioned earlier will present these issues and some of the options for discussion, and members opposite will be able to make their views known at that time before the final decision is made as to how that co-ordination will occur.

MR. A. BROWN: The Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg at the present time has approximately 150 volunteers working for them. What will happen to these volunteers?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the intention of reorganizing is partly to draw in many more volunteers from many other agencies. I expect that these individual volunteers will want to be involved in their particular regions and there will be more than ample provision for that through the system of resource centres that will be established in due course.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has appointed an interim board of five members. What is that board's responsibility at this time?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, to supervise and run the agency while the transition is occurring.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Given the possibility of a free vote on the government's side, will the First Minister encourage his members of caucus to participate in the debate to indicate their respective positions on this question? In other words, Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister encourage free speech prior to a free vote?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't really know where the Honourable Member for Elmwood has been for the last nine months. Without appearing to be disrespectful, it reminds one a little bit of Rip Van Winkle who's been sleeping for 99 years and then awakens, because honourable members on this side of the Chamber have been speaking out. They have been speaking for nine months, whether it be in this Chamber, whether it be in committee, there is no question as to the position of honourable members on this side of the Chamber. We would like very much to know, Mr. Speaker, whether the former Leader of the Conservative Party is correct - and there are two, three or four honourable members across the way, given a free vote, that would split ranks and vote with the government.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the First Minister, given that he may have better information than members on this side about the positions of his caucus members, would he not encourage some of the backbenchers and some of the Ministers, who have not participated in the debate and have not indicated their position, to participate in the debate and give the people of their constituency some indication as to how they will be voting on this question?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there has never been any question - and I'm surprised at the Honourable Member for Elmwood raising this question - there has never, never been at any time, again it appears to be

a figment of the imagination of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, there has never been anything but an extended debate, a participation by honourable members on this side of the Chamber. Members on this side of the Chamber have taken every opportunity, every opportunity, I believe that we've had 120, 130 speeches, many of them by backbenchers on this side of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. They have made their position clear. What does the honourable member want, that they make their position not only clear once, but twice, but 10 times, but 15 times before the Honourable Member for Elmwood will believe honourable members on this side of the Chamber?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister has said for eight or nine months in this Chamber that there would not be a free vote, that it wouldn't be necessary to have a free vote, that I was the only member of the government side who was in fact going to oppose the government and now, given the fact that the First Minister has suddenly said that there could be . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given eight months - well, I'm saying to the Premier - given that for eight months he has said it wasn't necessary to have a free vote, now he's saying that there may be a free vote, will he provide the members of his caucus with sufficient time to meet with members of the NDP constituency executives to inform them that they are going to in fact vote against the government proposals and thereby prepare them for the shock of them so doing?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I'm hearing from the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Obviously he's out of touch with the New Democratic Party grassroots of our movement. Our members are in constant contact with their executives, their memberships, Mr. Speaker - constantly. The only matter that is not clear, the only position that is not clear in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is the position of the Leader of the Opposition who assumed a position yesterday and has flip-flopped and is now unable to confirm the position that he took in this Chamber yesterday. He has flip-flopped because he is the captive of a hard-line group within his own caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House and most Manitobans know that the reason why the Member for Elmwood was asked to absent himself from the NDP Caucus . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . was because he was taking an opposing view on this question. Now with the flip-flop

that the First Minister has just indicated yesterday, that there will be a free vote, will he invite the Member for Elmwood back into his caucus and allow him to freely express himself as he says all members are free to do so in the NDP ranks?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the House Leader has received incorrect information from the Member for Elmwood.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood does not sit in this caucus, not because he disagreed with this caucus in respect to this position, but he dealt without honour in the caucus of the government in respect to this matter in that he was not up front with the people.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, is that the way anybody will be dealt with in that NDP caucus under this so-called free vote, that they will be called men without honour and expelled?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again the Honourable Member for Lakeside doesn't want to listen. The issue was not disagreement in respect to the Honourable Member for Elmwood's position, it was in respect to relationships with other members of caucus, not to do with the particular issue at stake, yes or no, but dealt with other matters pertaining to process, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know about the caucus across the way, but this caucus had free-wheeling exchange in respect to the different points at issue, in respect to the resolution and bill that is before us. We have not attempted to smother debate within our caucus, as may very well have been the case across the way, the caucus across the way.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the First Minister take what I consider to be a cheap shot at myself. He is now questioning my honour, Mr. Speaker. I have listened to the First Minister in the past few days, and I must say that my respect for him has hit an all-time low.

I heard him, a day or so ago, criticize Grant Russell, a man who has a heart condition, a man who is on medical disability, and I saw the First Minister kick that man, Mr. Speaker. It was not only my opinion that was a low blow, but that is the opinion of the people of Manitoba that the First Minister will stoop to anything

to advance his position. He knows no boundaries when he decides to fight to maintain his position.

I want to say in regard to myself, Mr. Speaker, that I had a disagreement with the First Minister and with the caucus, and I had a meeting with the First Minister and the Deputy First Minister on this question. We agreed that I would leave caucus and have the right to fight my position, and would not attend caucus.

Mr. Speaker, my position is based on my conscience; it is based on my decision as to what is in the best interests of my constituency and the Province of Manitoba. I believe that position is supported in Elmwood by the Elmwood NDP and by the people at large. All I can say is, I think that the First Minister should apologize to me personally for that cheap shot.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister wants to talk about honour, if he wants to talk about honour, let him question some of the members of his caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: You're out of order in more ways than one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

There is no point of privilege before the House since the member did not conclude his remarks with a substantive motion. In any case, matters internal to caucuses are not the business of this House.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable First Minister. I would ask him whether his reference to Rip Van Winkle having slept for 99 years really reflects his view of that occasion in legend, in literature, or whether it represents another attempt at revisionist history such as he's been practising with respect to The Manitoba Act of 1870 since this debate began?

HON. H. PAWLEY: What was the question? Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Perhaps I should rephrase the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I don't believe that the question referred to any matter that is within the administrative competence of the government. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would wish to reword his question.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer this question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to answer this question because the issue remains, and honourable members need not try to duck the issue that is at stake. Let honourable members not try to run away from the issue. The issue is one and one only this morning. Are the honourable members prepared to permit this matter to come to a vote as they committed themselves to do yesterday, or are they now running, tails between their legs, in fright from having a free vote on this matter today or next week? That is the issue that needs resolution and answering on the part of honourable members across the way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.
Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the issue is revisionist history - revision of the issue with respect to The Manitoba Act of 1870; revision of what happened in this House yesterday; revision by the First Minister of the whole question of a free debate, not only a free vote but a free debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I ask him, Sir, whether his lapse into a reference to Rip Van Winkle sleeping for 99 years was merely a lapse, or reflects another attempt at revisionist history?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss revisionist history from yesterday to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and, particularly, to the Leader of the Opposition and to the House Leader. Again, I read from Hansard, Mr. Speaker, so we not again suggest there has been revisionist history practised on this side of the Chamber.

"MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister is, if he is prepared to give a free vote, and we have a number of members who are absent, some out of the province, and we need some time to get them in for the vote, what's the difference if the free vote takes place today or takes place subsequently? What difference is there?"

Mr. Speaker, I proceed on later during the question and answer period, and say: "Mr. Speaker, we will have to check Hansard, but it was my understanding but a few moments ago that the Leader of the Opposition was challenging us to have a free vote and have a free vote now, today. We want to know from the Leader of the Opposition is it yes or no. Is he still prepared to accept the free vote that he indicated he was prepared to accept but a few moments ago in this Chamber?"

"MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Then, MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the First Minister that we will accept a free vote on our side of the House at anytime, whether it's today, tomorrow, or next week."

I ask, will it be today? Will it be next week? Or has the Honourable Leader of the Opposition slithered out of the offer that he made yesterday because he's had a change of mind or because he's been overwhelmed by the majority in his caucus? I want to know from the Leader of the Opposition, is he slithering, is he weaseling, is he withdrawing his offer of yesterday?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Premier that at anytime that the vote takes place . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, at anytime that the vote takes place, it will be a free vote on this side. Whether that be today, whether that be on Monday, or whether that be the following week, at anytime that vote takes place, it will be a free vote on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the position that was finally taken by the Leader of the Opposition and I'll get some transcripts for Monday . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Sorry - Mr. Speaker, the Premier is given to revisionist history, I'm anticipating the future.

Now that the Premier has told us that it will be a free vote on his side of the House when that vote takes place, Mr. Speaker, and we've established that principle, I want to know if he's had a chance to review the translation of *Le Devoir* and if he can say if his statement on that interview with respect his agreement to remove the term "official languages" from the constitutional amendment is accurate? And if so, Mr. Speaker, if he is willing to agree to remove that, will he then assure us that his caucus and the government will support our amendment which removes 23.1 and removes the term "official languages" and vote for the amended resolution and get on with the business of the House?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let's not worry about the paper in Montreal. Let's worry this morning, about the slithering and the weaseling that is taking place. Let's know this morning whether or not, specifically, and again I ask, "Is the Leader of the Opposition now saying that he is not prepared to accept a free vote in this Chamber today or next week?" Let the Leader of the Opposition state that clearly; let the Leader of the Opposition not continue to slither and to weasel; let the Leader of the Opposition face up; let's not permit the Leader of the Opposition to continue to duck a straight, clear question that only requires a yes or no response from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, once more for the Premier's benefit, to make it clear, since he keeps asking the question, at anytime that vote takes place, it will be a free vote on this side. I can't make it any more

clear to him. It's not his decision as to when that vote takes place, Mr. Speaker, we have something to say about it.

Mr. Speaker, I want . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . I want the Premier to answer whether or not he admits to the statements that are attributed to him in *Le Devoir* and is he then going to say that he will remove his hang-up with the term "official languages," he will vote with our amendment, and he will allow the amended resolution to pass this House?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again the question is clear. It's unequivocal. We're not trying to force the vote at any particular time. What we are prepared to do is accept the offer that the Leader of the Opposition made yesterday . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would suggest that question period is not the time for a debate between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier of the province and I think it's out of order on the part of both of them. I would ask you to so rule.

A MEMBER: You tell him, Henry.

A MEMBER: Another one you kicked out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Had the Honourable First Minister completed his answer?

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. A question of honour was raised during this morning's question period by the First Minister. I ask him a simple, straightforward question. Does he still honour the agreement that was signed by his Government House Leader and our House Leader at the time, the Member for Turtle Mountain, last August?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, we have honoured that agreement. We are prepared to honour that agreement. But I'm more interested in still knowing, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we can obtain a commitment from the House Leader as to the offer that was made, an offer that was made, not on a time-imposed vote on this side, but a suggested time for a vote from honourable members across the way, on a free vote next week. That's what I'm interested in; that is the relevant issue that's before us this morning; that is the relevant question that requires answering. That is a question that can be answered yes or no. Yes or no. It hardly requires slithering and maneuvering and

jumping around and dancing and ducking and diving and up and down, Mr. Speaker.

You know, honourable members - have we ever seen an elephant trying to do a somersault? I haven't, but I can imagine to see honourable members across the way, it's very comparable to an elephant attempting to do a somersault, Mr. Speaker. They placed themselves in a box yesterday and now they don't know how to get out of the box. They won't pick a date for the vote, they backed away from their commitments yesterday, Mr. Speaker, they repudiated their Leader, how can we accept their word? How can we accept their word if their Leader's word is repudiated by their own caucus?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussions that pursued in this House yesterday during question period, I would like to once again ask for leave of the House to suspend normal proceedings and proceed immediately to a vote on the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act that's before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to give leave?

Order please. Leave has not been given.

MR. H. ENNS: To the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order. Leave has been requested and denied.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, and the motion thereto proposed by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Member of Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me commence my remarks today by first apologizing to those people in the gallery for the conduct of the Premier and members of the government benches, and to some degree members on this side of the House, because I must say it must be a treat for them to come to this building, where they pay taxes in support of it for so many years, and witness the conduct that goes on this Chamber. As I say, I take some part of that blame myself, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully we can come to our senses in here and get back to some type of normal debate, which should be carried on in this Chamber, but as members here well know,

Mr. Speaker, in the heat of debate we, at times, get goaded into statements and reports back and forth across the House that are not always recorded in Hansard. But I notice of late that members seem to seize upon the odd quotation in Hansard with great glee and read it back and there are a great deal of Hansards that I have at my disposal, Mr. Speaker, and I will be reading some statements out of there in my remarks.

But, Mr. Speaker, on the motion before us that the question be now put, it has been made very very clear on this side of the House that there are parliamentary procedures available to us in the debate that has been going on for quite some time now on the French language question and the entrenchment of that in the Manitoba Constitution and the subsequent Bill 115 that provides for the extension of French language rights.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said on many many occasions by members on this side of the House that there is no one on this side opposed to the extension of French Language Services. It has also been stated on many occasions that the rights that were supposedly denied the French-speaking people by the act of 1890, all of those rights and privileges were restored in 1980, that is the French language was of equal use in the Legislature and in the courts of our land. Those rights were restored in 1980 and it was done without a lot of fanfare and without any secret deals being concocted with Lord knows who down in Ottawa and members of the SFM and Mr. Bilodeau, who had a case before the courts.

It has been mentioned time and time again about settlements out of court that are common and this was just one more settlement out of court. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this settlement out of court hasn't met with the approval of Manitobans to a large degree. I don't know who members on the opposite side of the House have been listening to, but it has not met with the approval of Manitobans to any large degree and members are going to find that out in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have been selective and all of a sudden the former leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Spivak, is a great source of joy to them, because apparently in an interview somewhere with someone he had made a remark that indicated that what the government was doing was maybe acceptable. It's the first time I have seen them embrace that former leader to their breast, Mr. Speaker. He was referred to with Mr. Asper, who sat here representing the Liberal Party, as the gold-dust twins from River Heights. They riled and ridiculed him for his philosophy . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: What did you do?

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . and his policies on every occasion.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: Now they're taking him to their breast as a great saviour and a way out of the mess that they find themselves in on the bungling and ham-handed

way that they have brought this mess and hemorrhaged the course of action and really, Mr. Speaker, have started something that this province is going to suffer from for years to come. It's a sad day when a situation that had been progressing well and slowly and acceptable got taken by an inept government that was incapable of making a deal with anyone.

I can cite case after case, Mr. Speaker, of things that this government has bungled and the French language issue is only one. We only have to look back to my own area, the University of Brandon, McKenzie Seeds. We could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, and their own members are saying I don't know what it is, I helped elect this government in 1981, but everything they've touched turns out to be a mess. That is becoming a pretty common statement by many many many members or former members that supported that government, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Inkster seemed to be overjoyed last night and got up and read into the record for 10 or 15 minutes a great list of editorials. Well, if that seemed to be the order of the day, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take that privilege also and read one into the record.

Mr. Speaker, this is an article that's in today's Free Press written by Mr. Fred Cleverley and I know members on the opposite side are not great supporters of his, yet they seem to read all of the editorials out of the Free Press over the last few months with great glee. They were selective in picking them out, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless, I'm going to treat them to the editorial in today's Free Press.

A MEMBER: How about the Manitoba Business Editorials?

MR. D. BLAKE: I maybe have some of those to read yet.

"The Conservative Opposition to the Pawley Government's French-language legislation is based upon the consequences of passing the legislation. At a public meeting last week former Conservative Leader Sterling Lyon made the political foundation clear. He said that the Conservative members would not help the government, in any way, to put into place 'what 78 percent of the people of Manitoba do not want'." And that's a fact, Mr. Speaker.

He goes on in the article to state, "The legal foundation for the Tory Opposition comes from a Deputy Minister, Mr. Tallin, who is Legislative Counsel to the Assembly." I won't go into too much of that because the Member for Charleswood read a great number of those opinions into the record when he was speaking a few days ago.

But Mr. Mercier, the former Attorney-General, had asked Mr. Tallin for some opinions, Mr. Speaker, something that this government had not done, had been warned about, and had been asked to do. "Mr. Mercier asked Mr. Tallin for a resume of other Manitoba laws in force that would be entrenched once the amendment becomes part of the Constitution. Here are some of the rights that could be enshrined. At the moment, Tallin says, in most areas of business, citizens have the right to write their contracts in whatever language they wish. The Conservatives interpret this as meaning that after the constitutional amendment is passed, one party

to a contract would have a constitutional right to a court ruling on what language had to be used. Also involved is The Public Schools Act, which deals with the language of instruction and allows requests for special language instruction based on the numbers of parents requesting such instruction."

I just pause to wonder if the Minister of Education has taken time to do some cost projections and projections on our education system of what might be down the road, five, ten years from now, Mr. Speaker, when a small number of parents may request full French services in the education facility in their area, and this is going to have to be provided, at what cost to the taxpayer, we have no idea.

"The Conservatives interpret this," he goes on to say, "as meaning that the present figures would be fixed for all time, allowing no flexibility whatsoever. Tallin says the present permission to use either English or French under Section 10 of The Builders' Liens Act and the records required to be kept for the purposes of the act including records of employees hours and wages, could be entrenched in the Constitution under the amendment. Also frozen would be The Business Names Registration Act and The Vital Statistics Act.

"Premier Howard Pawley said on February 1st in the Legislature: 'The House Leader has pointed out that the preparatory words are not expansionary.'

"Tallin writes: 'In my view the courts would probably give a very broad meaning to the word 'freedom' (as in freedom to use). This broad meaning would probably include all rights and privileges bestowed on persons under the law of Manitoba whether the law was statutory or common law.'"

He goes on and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "Depending which side they are on in the language issue, Manitobans either love Grant Russell, the head of Grassroots Manitoba, or they hate him. Russell's former employer, the Federal Department of Immigration, has made its feelings pretty clear in a letter to Russell advising him that he must not continue his activities in the language issue because of a section of federal regulations that prohibits employees from criticizing the Minister or the departmental policies."

Mr. Cleverley goes on to say, "I have heard Russell speak on occasion, and have yet to hear him speak badly about federal Immigration Minister immigration department policies.

"Premier Pawley has taken the matter a step further, questioning the basis of Russell's disability pension, and saying that he should be back at work. Pawley said: ". . . if Mr. Russell is well enough to be working practically on a full-time basis for Grassroots, he might be well enough to be back at work for the Federal Government rather than drawing taxpayers' money on sick leave."

We've heard, Mr. Speaker, and I digress, about the low blow and the sleazy move that it was to attack someone, and we have heard members across the way, jump up in rage when a Deputy Minister or someone outside of this Chamber has been criticized. They jump up and say, it's unfair, it's unconstitutional, unparliamentary to attack someone who is not in this House to defend themselves, and God, they beat their breasts and puff out their chests, the great defenders of rights and freedoms, and this First Minister, this Premier of our province, has the nerve and the gall to

attack a man like Mr. Russell. It's just inconceivable, Mr. Speaker.

It goes on to say, "Many people will thank Dr. Pawley for his expert opinion. He should check his facts. The pension Russell is receiving is not coming from tax money, but from a private disability insurance policy for which Russell has paid his own premiums. I have always found that a good way of determining the fairness of any action is to put the shoe on the other foot. Suppose Russell had been working as hard as he has been, but to promote the Pawley government's language proposals. Would the Federal Department of Immigration been as quick to tell him to stop? Would the Premier be so anxious to condemn a Manitoba citizen that he goes public with allegations he has not bothered to check? Should Pawley suggest that he was somehow cheating the taxpayers of his pension because he has taken his doctor's advice and gone on a medical disability pension, even if it were the case?

"The answer, of course, is no to all the questions. What has happened just underlines the inept way the government has handled the whole thing."

Mr. Speaker, that tells a great deal. That attack on Mr. Russell that has been mentioned before by other members here is a very very cheap shot. There are members of his own government benches that drew disability or incompatibility pay while they were serving this government in various positions. It's not an uncommon thing, Mr. Speaker, when people have disability pensions and provisions in their employment regulations that they're able to draw.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote another article that was the topic of today's broadcast over CJOB by Mr. Eric Wells on the free vote. "As Manitobans have reason to know," and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, "our political system is deficient in resolving constitutional issues. When we see a division between the government and the opposition in such matters, then we are almost guaranteed that a prolonged period of acrimony will follow and that the public forum will be fragmented on 100 irrelevant additional topics. In federal affairs on such occasions, it has fallen to the lot of the Governor-General to point out some avenues of compromise. The Governor-General usually has a few quiet words with the Prime Minister and although such words of advice seldom appear on the public record, still we know there have been occasions in which the Governors-General have exercised influence for the benefit of all Canadians in their constitutional troubles.

"According to the word going around Ottawa, this occurred in the past two years, when Ed Schreyer let it be known that he would not accept any parliamentary short-cuts subverting the role of the provinces in our new Charter of Rights," and this advice was followed by the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. "But in Manitoba so far, we've struck out in all attempts to resolve our constitutional problems through political expression. Still, if the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition are willing to abide by a free vote in the Legislature, then that's the best approach we've heard about. On that basis, each MLA, for better or for worse, must stand by his own conscience in relation to his constituency and out of the prolonged gabfest the free vote is the best suggestion to surface on Broadway. In fact it is the only unused gear shift we've got left in our broken-down political machine."

Mr. Speaker, on the free vote. I just want to speak to some of the members on the opposite benches, because where they have been - and I'm sure they tour their constituencies as we all do - who they have been listening to, where they have been getting their advice from, I really don't know. I particularly refer to those who are affectionately referred to as "old landslide" from Thompson, who won by 48 votes last election; the Honourable Member for River East who won by 42 votes and there are others who skinned by - about 200 in the Ste. Rose constituency or something like that.

So, Mr. Speaker, to those people, the Member for Riel and others on that side that slipped in on a shoestring last election . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Will slide out on a toboggan slide.

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . will slide out on a toboggan slide, as my House Leader says. Mr. Speaker, I urge those members to go out into their constituencies. The Member for Ste. Rose is chirping away from his seat. I have only had five letters and he is in maybe an area that does have some Francophone connection, but I urge the Member for Ste. Rose to go out in his constituency and do an honest-to-goodness poll of the attitudes and the feelings of the people in his area.

The Member for Ste. Rose just said I don't run my operation by poll. Yes, that's right, Mr. Speaker, I've just been reminded of the questions that I asked. He's hired a \$30,000 executive assistant to stomp the constituency and do his bidding.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services on a point of order.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said I should go and find out what is happening in my constituency on this issue. I want to tell him that I can count on my hands in the last nine months the letters or phone calls that I have received in opposition to this proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

A MEMBER: Call a by-election, if you're so sure.

MR. D. BLAKE: I have always felt that a difference of opinion was not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but I thank you for your ruling.

Mr. Speaker, he might have only had five letters. That's not what I'm referring to. I'm telling him to go out and talk to people and find out what they're really thinking because I can assure him that if that's what he's basing his opinion on and that's what he's going to vote on, I'll tell you, he's got an awful shock coming next election, and I can sympathize with his position. He's bilingual, Mr. Speaker, and I wish that I were bilingual. I compliment him for the fact that he was able to keep the language he was raised in and he does represent an area that has a fairly good Francophone population. I can appreciate his position, but I can't understand these other members who have not been listening to their constituents. His seatmate,

the Member for the Interlake, is certainly not listening to his constituents. He is not listening to them at all and he's going to have to search his conscience when it comes to vote on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, on what basis this government really got into this conundrum that they're into on the French language issue. — (Interjection) — I'll get to that. Did they, Mr. Speaker, do their research? We know that the Attorney-General, that great legal mind and legal law professor, professor of law, orchestrated the deal on the Bilodeau case to save the nation from God knows what, we've been told. We never will know unless it goes to the Supreme Court and we find out for sure whether we've been saved from anything or whether we've been put through this agony for the last nine months for naught.

If they were really interested in finding out what the position was, Mr. Speaker, I think they could have gone to New Brunswick. That would have been my first reaction. There's a bilingual province that is in turmoil in a great many areas and they are going through great times of agony in trying to bilingualize their province. I have talked to people who have been born and raised there, Mr. Speaker, and they tell me that, while it sounded like a great and glorious move at the time, that the Acadian population, that the bilingual bill was brought into help, have really not benefited, because all of the jobs, the university jobs, and various other senior positions required academics. They came in from Quebec; they came over from France, set up the universities, took over all of the translation jobs that were necessary.

The local people did not benefit one bit, and those who were not bilingual have been taken out of their position, have been told they cannot advance beyond this post because they are not bilingual. If this government had taken the time, Mr. Speaker, to go down there and do a little research, they're always taking junkets across the country. If they had taken time, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — absolutely.

My House Leader says why run to China and Japan? They could have gone down there and found out something that's really affecting the people back home. This would have given them a bird's-eye view or a thumbnail sketch of what is liable to happen to this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Grassroots movement has been ridiculed. We've heard statements about rent-a-crowd, a Tory portable crowd. Mr. Speaker, I went to the meeting in the Convention Centre a week ago with 3,000 people there; they weren't radicals. They weren't the three-piece pinstripe suit executive boardroom type of person that they like to tag on the Conservative Party, they were ordinary working people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose questions my numbers. There were a few of the henchmen of the NDP Party there. I'm sure they did a pretty good head count. They came there looking for the radicals and the rednecks. Who did they find? D.L. Campbell, well-known former Premier of this province; Bobby Bend, a former Liberal Cabinet Minister; former Premier, the Honourable Sterling Lyon; their former member, Russ Doern, the Honourable Russ Doern, former Minister in Schreyer's Cabinet; Herb Schulz, brother-in-law of the former Governor-General. These were not radical people; these were concerned

citizens of Manitoba. They stood on the same platform for one reason, Mr. Speaker, because this legislation is bad for Manitoba. They were there for one reason.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get personal, but at that rally a gentleman came up to me and he said, "I have always worked for the NDP. Mr. Walding is my member. I want to tell you that I have handed in my membership, I've joined the Conservative Party and I want you to deliver my message to Mr. Walding." I said I will do that. And he said, "And also to the Premier." I indicated to him when I spoke on this issue that I would deliver that and send him a copy of Hansard.

Mr. Harold and Veronica Wilkinson, Mr. Speaker, who are members of your constituency, also Mr. Sherman Strutt, they have told me that they have left the NDP Party and will not be supporting it in the next election. There are hundreds of thousands of NDP memberships that are lapsing, that are being turned in, and these members refuse to listen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon West and the Member for Brandon East I know are concerned about this issue, and I hope that they will be attending the meeting out there on Monday night that's being held in their area, because then they will get a feel of what's happening in their particular area.

There was a meeting on Wednesday night in the Premier's home constituency of Selkirk, Mr. Speaker. We have had some good press reports on that. There was a straw poll done at the door. There were 102 people against what the government is doing, and 13 in favour. That's about 88.6 percent.

The Premier jumps up and defends that position and says, well there were 400-and-some people there. Where were the rest of them? Well if they were his supporters, Mr. Speaker, surely they would have voted on the Premier's side. But no, they refused to put an opinion down at all.

If ever there was a constituency that could have been organized with a solid supporting crowd for the governing party, it would have been the Premier's own constituency, but they couldn't get those people out, Mr. Speaker, because they are leaving the party. The Premier knows that his strong support in Selkirk comes from the Steelworkers' Union and members of the Manitoba Rolling Mill. Members came to that meeting and said, no more, Mr. Speaker, no more. Now I don't know what stronger message the Premier needs than that.

MR. H. ENNS: On the other hand, we know what a stronger message is.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: I think the Member for Flin Flon has got to be a little concerned, because there is strong union support for his party in Flin Flon. He tells me that there is no problem there - well he's not talking to the right people, Mr. Speaker, because he'll find out next election how popular this great and wonderful conscientious vote of his going to be. He's a pretty young politician, Mr. Speaker, and probably has a lot of years ahead of him that he could contribute if he

can ever get elected. But I'll tell him if he's thinking of staying in politics, he'd better look to what the people want because that's how you stay in politics.

You were elected by the people to handle your constituency affairs, not to come in here — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, the young neophyte Cabinet Minister from Flin Flon is rambling on, saying, I was elected to let my conscience govern me in the decisions I make in this Chamber. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I've got news for him. He is going to have a damn short career in politics, because his conscience doesn't represent the feeling of the people in his constituency — (Interjection) — well, I'll tell you . . .

The Member for River East talks about integrity. Mr. Speaker, I just don't have the clipping with me, but it's available. A former member has it. It was a fairly large headline. "The name of the game is getting re-elected, even if it means bending your principles." That wasn't a Conservative. That was the former Governor-General of this country, the Honourable Ed Schreyer. Ed Schreyer knew the name of the game.

The Member for River East is skidding around with a 42-vote majority. Well I wonder how long his principle is going to hold out next election. He'll be long gone. I don't know what he's going to do, because he can't get back into the United States to work there so he'll have to go around looking for a handout somewhere in his new-found country, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, some of the members opposite have ridden along with the popularity of the new-found victory they had in 1981, thinking the front bench is doing everything that's great and wonderful. Well we've seen how many mismanaged, bungled projects they've gone into already, Mr. Speaker, and they're half-way through their term.

Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to know, and I know that I may be straying a little bit from the motion that the question be put. You have allowed considerable latitude in other speeches, I've noticed, so I hope you'll allow me the same.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to read all of this because it would take too long, but there is one little bit of material that I want to use. All of our members have used this great missal that was put out last election, Manitoba, a great province where the Premier guaranteed that no one would be without jobs — (Interjection) — he guaranteed goodness knows what.

The Member for Ste. Rose said, he won us the election. Well we were just talking about principle and integrity - the Member for River East talked about principle and integrity. If they believe in principle and integrity, Mr. Speaker, - my God! - they must not sleep at night when they go through this booklet.

Here is just one that came out on the health care, "Care, not cutbacks." The Member for Inkster was great with newspaper clippings the other night, "Care, not cutbacks . . . Medical crisis is purely a matter of money . . . Doctor shortage plagues rural areas . . . New moms tell of HSC bedlam . . . Maternity ward chaos faces makeshift birth." Well, these are mostly from the Winnipeg Free Press, because unfortunately

it is the only paper we've got. Well, we do have The Winnipeg Sun now.

"Higher fees urged for rural doctors . . . Swerhone's remarks and about-face. The Health Sciences Centre is taking a lot of heat lately, and the man on the hot seat is Peter Swerhone, the hospital's President." It goes on to mention the problems there. "Failure at the hospitals . . . Judge criticizes HSC nursery staffing level . . . Unacceptably low staffing cited . . . Reviews staffing . . . Staff woes plague HSC ward . . . Boss calls probe into staffing dilemma . . . Bed shortage cited in deaths of four patients . . . Hospital in crisis . . . Doctors linked to bed shortage . . . Heart surgery, big worry, doctors say . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the desire of honourable members opposite to engage in a Throne Speech-type debate, seeing as how we are approaching the time when the Throne Speech would normally occur. But the motion before us is a matter of privilege relating to a change in our rules and forms of proceeding of the House. Certainly reports on the Health Sciences Centre or health care somehow don't appear to follow our rule of relevance, Sir, that debates in the Chamber should be strictly relevant to the matter under consideration.

I know there's been a fair amount of latitude but at this point, Mr. Speaker, I think we have clearly gone beyond the bounds of the latitude provided under that rule.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that I can't recall a speech lately in this House that hasn't been more specifically directed and more poignantly directed to the issue at hand, and I would ask that you allow the Member for Minnedosa to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster to the same point.

MR. D. SCOTT: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, we on this side have been very conscientious to stick to the actual debate itself. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources stuck specifically to the issue of bell ringing. The Honourable Minister of Health as well stuck strictly to the issue of bell ringing, as I did last night. Every one of the quotes that I used, be it from the members opposite or from the newspaper editorials and the editorial writers of this province, have been specifically directed to the issue of bell ringing. I wish that we had the same sort of respect for the rules of this Legislature from the members opposite because few of them have hardly even mentioned the issue, but they've talked about everything else but.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Inkster and I hope that all members of the House would respect its rules.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's been necessary to ring the bells and the members opposite know it. It's one way to get the message out to the people because of the mess that this government is getting us into. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to read all of them because it's quite lengthy, but "Rural operating rooms understaffed." These are some of the reasons: "Inquest into suicide urged," and they promised care and not cutbacks in the hospital field I'm — (Interjection) — That came to mind, Mr. Speaker, because somebody on that side was talking about integrity.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the debate has been a little far-ranging, but the bells are ringing because we felt that this was the only way that the message was going to get out to the public to let them know what this legislation was going to do when it came in, or what it might mean for the people of Manitoba and for the generations coming up and the generations unborn. That's why the bells have been ringing. We felt we had to bring this government to its senses and this seemed to be the only method, short of taking them out in the alley and giving them a whipping, to knock some sense into them.

This was the only tool at our disposal. It was the parliamentary procedure necessary. So that's why the bells have been ringing. We realize the government has the power to bring in closure. I've said from my seat, "Bring in closure." They realize that they should have done it long ago. They should have done it long ago, but if they'd of handled this issue intelligently, Mr. Speaker - they realized the former House Leader had got them into such a jam and such a mess that they weren't going to get out of it, so they slid him off to Saint Lucia or Grenada or somewhere for a holiday, slipped in a new little pipsqueak of a Minister and handed him the job of piloting this through the House.

Mr. Speaker, he did have some credibility and a little respect on this side of the House, but I'm afraid he's lost that. That's the penalty he's paid for trying to get the government out of the mess that they got themselves into. That's why the bells are ringing. If he had of followed his first program, when he brought the bills in, Mr. Speaker, we would have been out of speakers long ago. If he hadn't provoked us into bell ringing, Mr. Speaker, we would have been out of material, we would have been out of debate, and the thing would have been long gone and long put to rest.

The agony that we've gone through in this province for the last eight, nine months, when the Premier stands up one day and says, I don't know what the fuss is about - 58 out of 61 on my priority list, this is the 58th. I know we should have been discussing jobs and various other things that are important to our economy like the agriculture and other important matters that are before us; I don't know how long it's going to be before we get back into the House to get at these things, but if this is 58 out of 61, Mr. Speaker, why he has put his party and his members through this agony is beyond me, because one of his own members got up at the meeting last Wednesday night and said are you not destroying our party and you will bring us to defeat in the next election. The Premier got up and said that may very well be so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why any government would want to cut their own throats in the middle of a term is absolutely incomprehensible. What the reward at the end of the field or the end of the tunnel is, Mr. Speaker, we don't know. There has to be a payoff somewhere, whether it's to the Attorney-General, whether it's to the Premier, or the SFM, or Mr. Bilodeau, who are all parties to the debate. Where the payoff is, we don't know, Mr. Speaker, but there has to be a reason for the First Minister and this government embarking on the course that they have undertaken.

HON. A. ANSTETT: A matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member has alleged that either the Attorney-General or the Premier have been paid off, that there has been a - he used both the word "paid off" and the word "payoff" to those honourable members.

Mr. Speaker, clearly an apology to this House and a withdrawal for that statement is in order and if the member is not willing to provide same immediately, I am prepared to move the necessary motion requesting same.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Honourable Member for Minnedosa would not like to leave those words on the record.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, if the new-found House Leader finds that unparliamentary or offensive to him, I have no problem in withdrawing those words. But the point I want to make is, where is the reward that this Premier, this First Minister, would lead his sheep to slaughter and get them into such a turmoil and turn this province, neighbour against neighbour, stir up old hatreds that have been long gone . . .

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Why are you doing it?

MR. D. BLAKE: Why are we doing that the Minister of Labour says, Mr. Speaker. We have not done it.

MR. H. ENNS: You have done it.

MR. B. BLAKE: We have not done it. You brought the bill in. You have got to take the responsibility for it. It's your proposal and there's nothing on our hands whatsoever, but if he feels, Mr. Speaker, that "payoff" is unparliamentary I have no problem withdrawing it. But there has to be a reason. The people out there are saying, why would the government do it? Who talked them into it? What is the reason for it?

HON. B. URUSKI: That's what you call gutter politics.

A MEMBER: You should know Billie.

MR. D. BLAKE: Billie, I don't know what the Minister of Agriculture is talking about when he talks gutter politics, Mr. Speaker. . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: You know damn well what I'm talking about.

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . because we have heard statements coming from that side of the House that give us a good indication that they know what gutter politics are all about and there was a pretty good example of it when they won an election by publishing a bunch of half-truths, statements that were unparallel with the truth, Mr. Speaker, and won an election on it, and as I say, I only gave them one example - "Care, not cutbacks" and I read a few of them. Mr. Speaker, they can't talk to us about integrity in politics and integrity in government.

As I mentioned before to those members, the Member for Gimli and others that have been elected on a shoestring, get out and find out. You're got a chance now on a free vote. You don't have to hide behind the Whip being on. Reflect the wishes of your constituents when you get a free vote.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to join the debate on the motion of the Minister of Natural Resources. I think we should all participate in this particular debate, the members of the government side as well. I think their contributions should be heard.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has most disturbed me over the past number of months . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, in terms of entertainment, the debate that's going on below me is far more exciting than anything I could possibly say. We ought to have the "Larry and Donny Show," I think it would probably do well on television.

There is one thing that has been really concerning me and we saw some manifestations of it a number of weeks ago. There's an organization called Grassroots. This organization received support from some groups that I think every member in this House would call the crazies or the loony fringe. I don't think there is any member in this House who subscribes to what they are suggesting. What I am getting at, though, Mr. Speaker, is those that oppose the government legislation are no more responsible for the people that may happen to agree with us than are the loony fringe at the other side who may support the government's position. I don't hold the government responsible for the people that make stupid comments in support of them. They have no control over these.

There is one group that is supporting the government though. I don't know that the government has asked

for this support or in fact wants this support, but I've had a concern over the past week because of the support of the national CBC. I feel that there has been a major propaganda effort at the national level by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I will present what I consider the evidence. It's got me convinced and, as far as I'm concerned, I have to convince myself first.

I'll start at the earliest instance. This goes back to yesterday morning on CBC radio. There was a Mr. Pressey, who is a well-known psychologist and a man that I admire. I agree with him, therefore he must be a very fine person and I listened to him and I thought, good, the CBC is finally showing some fairness. I listened a little while longer and there was fellow named Bailey came on and all of a sudden, yes, if it's someone who supports the opposition, they will immediately put on the CBC a rebuttal person. He didn't do a super job in rebuttal but he did rebut the situation.

When I first got interested in this was, I believe, about a week ago Friday. I was listening to the CBC in the morning and the morning is my time to drink coffee and rather be at peace with the world and — (Interjection) — Is evenings your time of day? Well, my time is the morning, a cup of black coffee will do. And I heard on the CBC a commentary by one, I believe the name was Greta Chambers, a Montreal columnist. She was really in touch with Manitoba! She was a condescending know-it-all whose facts were wrong and whose tone was insulting.

We don't need Montreal or Eastern people coming here and lording over us, calling us bigots, not having her facts correct and saying, "But of course, we in the East, we know what's right and we'll send a little support to the Government of Manitoba by telling all of you peasants out West the way things really are." Well, my hackles went up; they're still up. Of course, this made me rather conscious of what I was hearing on the CBC and I must stress this didn't come out of Winnipeg, this came out of Eastern Canada, but I became very very conscious of the CBC.

Then I was listening to the program Sunday morning, this Sunday, again drinking coffee, which I do very well. — (Interjection) — Would that it were. The CBC announcer on this national program is telling us about a Grassroots meeting that took place a week ago Thursday night! in the City of Winnipeg. I happened to be at that meeting and I happened to observe who was at the head table of that meeting. I believe Russell Doern was there, Herb Schulz was there, I recall that there was Sterling Lyon, and Mrs. Monkman was there, and Mr. Russell was there. Then I recall that there was a D.L. Campbell and Mr. Bend, and then I remembered that Mr. D.L. Campbell is the elder statesman of the Province of Manitoba, a former Liberal Premier, a member of this House for over 40 years, still a very very dapper looking, very very well-spoken gentleman, who spoke very nicely and from where I was sitting appeared to be one of the keystone speakers at this event where there were some 2,500 people. So when I heard the announcer say that this meeting had a head table and at the head table there were some dissident New Democrats and Tories. I dropped my cup of coffee and I said - well, I'm not going to say what I said because that's not parliamentary.

This, Mr. Speaker, is propaganda of the worst kind. This is not reporting, this is slanting of the news and

this instance, together with other instances that I've heard, convinces me at least, personally, that the CBC is trying to propagandize the people of Manitoba and I resent that. I think that — (Interjection) — the taxpayers' dollars. We are all paying for the CBC, we're paying mightily for it. I resent in the guise of hard news propaganda, and I'd like to criticize the National CBC in the strongest terms because they are interfering here in a manner in which I resent and a manner which I think is highly improper. It interferes with the proper running of this House, the debate in this House. The motion that we're debating deals with a time limit. In the midst of this type of debate, we have the CBC at a national level propaganda, I think. I resent that, Mr. Speaker.

Just to continue on with the CBC, on the way down to the Legislature this morning, Mr. Speaker, I listened to it and there was one Barry Zwicker (phonetic) who is a free-lance commentator on the CBC. Here he is, speaking on the other side of the mouth. He is criticizing the print media for being in the hands of a number of barons, and that there is no proper news throughout the country in the print, and that the CBC is one of the major outlets of truth in Canada. Ridiculous!

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on in my address right now. At the Grassroots meeting a week ago Thursday and earlier in speeches, the Honourable Member for Charleswood made a number of statements to the effect that he is finding himself surrounded by some strange bedfellows. Well I have to find myself just figuratively, Mr. Speaker, figuratively, in bed with the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

He said yesterday in his speech that there is absolutely no need to amend Section 23. Mr. Speaker, he is absolutely correct. No amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is required. What we are doing now is a gratuitous exercise by this government. They made a gesture; the gesture has backfired; we have a 'government now that doesn't know how to extricate itself, a government that wishes this had never happened, and a government that doesn't know what do to about it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel as if I'm a bit player in a play by Shakespeare. I watched the Premier and his key leaders make great speeches. I watched the Leader of the Opposition rebut and make great speeches. I feel as if I'm probably a spear bearer in the back row, occasionally saying a word. We're in the final act in the final scene in this wonderful play by Shakespeare, and nobody knows yet how it's going to end.

Mr. Speaker, most playwrights, most people with vision, most people with foresight know how things are going to end before they get into them. You don't drive down the road blindfolded, and I think this is what's happened for the past nine months. The government didn't know where it was going, and doesn't know where it will be when it gets there.

A MEMBER: Let's talk about the motion.

MR. H. CARROLL: Somebody said, why don't I talk about the motion? A member has asked me, do I want the bells to ring? And that's a legitimate question, Mr. Speaker. I went back to Brandon, and I started asking questions, this very question. I like to be close to my

constituents. I like to know what they're thinking, and I like to convey their actual thoughts - very interesting.

I would like to give a couple of examples. This is just fascinating. These are two examples that happened to me in the last two days. We had some company over at our place the night before last, another couple that are old friends of ours. I have no idea what their politics are. In our home, politics and friendship don't necessarily have anything to do with each other.

I said, should the bells be ringing? Obviously, the couple hadn't discussed this before. They hadn't thought of it. The husband jumped up and he says, Henry, keep those bells ringing. And the wife jumped and says, enough of this foolishness. Two hours later, that couple was still arguing whether the bells should be ringing or whether we should be letting the government's motion go through — (Interjection) —

Again last night, I did the same question with another couple. Only it was this time it was the wife who said the bells must keep ringing, and the husband was saying that we ought to stop.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Which side are you on, Henry?

MR. H. CARROLL: Up to this point, I was figuratively in bed with the Member for Charleswood, and I'm not going to get involved in that type of discussion further.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You're in bed with Sterling?

MR. H. CARROLL: Figuratively, figuratively.

I then went to the source of all political information in Brandon, my service station. I filled my car up with gasoline yesterday and I said to Nick, what do you think about all this? Nick says to me, Henry, I think it's pretty well over. I think you better give in. Whereupon his assistant says, never let those bells stop. Again as I drive away, the two of them were still arguing.

So all I am suggesting, those of us on this side . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: Did you do anything to help the decision?

MR. H. CARROLL: The Member for Inkster asked if I did anything to help them with the decision. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have enough confidence in the intelligence of my constituents to understand what the basic situation is without imposing my views, slanted or unslanted as they be.

But I am suggesting that there isn't a consensus yet arrived at in this province, and I . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: There is on bell ringing.

MR. H. CARROLL: There is no consensus yet, Mr. Speaker, from what I've seen. I have seen the division. There is a division on the bell ringing. How was that, Mr. Speaker? - a division on the bell ringing. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, what I am seeing is that although the people I'm talking to are of mixed opinions on the bell ringing, they are not of mixed opinion on the basic issue before us, the issue of bilingual entrenchment and extension. In terms of the extension, there is absolutely no support or none that has come forward to me in the Brandon West constituency.

I don't like to inflame issues, but I must indicate to the House an incident that happened in Brandon some 10 days ago. I was in Winnipeg at the House. I came back to my constituency office and my secretary was somewhat upset and indicated that a gentleman from west of Virden had been in and he had indicated that he had been a New Democrat. He had taken out a New Democratic Party card and wanted to burn it in my front office. I don't know why he'd pick on my office, I haven't been a member of that caucus for a year-and-one-half, but I would think he wanted by make a symbolic gesture of some sort. My secretary was really distressed. Fortunately, my office is a non-smoking office, there are no ashtrays present and she convinced him that if he wanted to do a symbolic act he could do it somewhere else. But remember when you're talking west of Virden, there are only four New Democrats there anyhow and when one of them is coming into my office and wanting to burn his card, it indicates . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to discuss some of the ramifications of what we are doing now and the ramifications of the process that we have gone through. At the hearings a number of weeks ago, I listened with great interest to Mr. Pressey. He spoke well and he indicated to us what the long-term effects could be. The short-term effects can be antipathy to the government, some of this has been seen, some of this will continue to be seen. Governments come and governments go, but the people of Manitoba have to remain and our Francophones have to remain and they are going to be remaining in a province that has been stirred up.

There is going to be some long-term damage in the words of Mr. Pressey. There is going to be a disruption and there has been a disruption in communities that have had great relationships for an awful lot of years and all of a sudden these relationships are starting to become more and more tenuous and I resent this. I don't think this was necessary.

You know, if I had been convinced, as the government is convinced, that this bill was the proper thing, I hope they took into account what will happen in the small communities throughout our province. I hope this was part of the formula that they worked out. I hope these were the things that contributed to the debates they had, before they brought these motions forward, because these are the true ramifications at the local level.

I'd like to end up again by discussing the role of the national media. On a larger level than just here in Manitoba, the examples that I have cited and I have seen, really upset me and not just on this issue. As a person that values our democratic principles so very highly, I worry - and whether I was on this side of the issue or on the other side of the issue, I'd be as concerned when I see our national institutions propagandizing. I'd like to stress that this isn't right. We have a national institution controlled by the purse strings, at least, by a government in Ottawa, supporting the view that the government in Ottawa wants to put forward and it's frightening, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about the whole process of bell ringing. I would suggest that there is going to have to be accommodations made in the future. I think everyone in this House appreciates the damage that this type of thing can cause. None of us like this. There are legitimate positions taken on both sides. I do my best to try to respect the positions of both. It's not an easy issue for anybody. I think we have a duty to follow our principles.

I feel very strongly that the government should withdraw its bill, and the methods that we're using on this side are methods that are trying to convince the government to do that.

Mr. Speaker, when this whole matter was set in motion, if the government leaders had foreseen - in law there's a concept of foreseeability and I wish leaders of the government had used the idea of foreseeability before they went forward with this and we wouldn't be in this impasse right now.

I am very very concerned with what's happened in Manitoba. I am very concerned that debate should be cut off and shortened. I would think, with all due respect to the Minister of Natural Resources, that even the lungs and the tongues and the mouths of this side of the House would eventually slow down and that without closure this matter would have come to a vote. It's a pity there wasn't the patience, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'm participating in a sad debate because this debate will present no winners, and it's a question of how bad all of us lose.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I've been sitting patiently listening to the debate on this motion of privilege trying to determine whether the members opposite had any way to back up their behaviour and to show the House that there hasn't been a breach of privilege of the House. Instead there has been all kinds of comments one way or another about the resolution, or about things totally extraneous to the motion of privilege before us.

I guess the greatest disappointment I felt, considering that when I was elected I was really humbled by the trust and the responsibility that was given to me by my constituents, and even though I have been politically active for years, I still had some illusions about the quality of debate and the quality of behaviour that was required in the House.

The quality of debate has been a great disappointment to me, but I think the behaviour of the opposition has been a massive disappointment, especially over the last period - not to mention last summer - but over the last months in terms of their bell-ringing tactics. I think the most interesting part of that, when I sit and analyze that behaviour, I see these well-known advocates of the free enterprise system who have always resisted any attempts by working people in this province to better their working conditions. I don't think that there's a better example for working people in this province of the Tory double standard; they have one law for the workers of this province and another law for themselves.

In labour terminology, their behaviour can only be called a wildcat strike, for if any worker in this province

walked out the way the opposition has been walking out on their responsibility and their duties, they would have either been fired, if they didn't belong to a union, or if they didn't have a contract with their employer, or they would be ordered back to work, or there would be police brought in to escort scabs through their picket line to take their jobs. Any worker who didn't come to work and put in a full day's work would not be getting their pay cheque, in fact, would be fired. There isn't a worker in this province that would get paid while they were on a picket line or paid while they were on a work stoppage. I have no doubt that if the opposition were on this side of the House and their civil servants walked out in mass that they would not hesitate to bring the full force of the law, as well as back-to-work legislation, to force those civil servants back to work.

In fact, they would follow the example of their Tory counterparts in other provinces, who, for instance, when Grace Hartman refused to order her hospital workers back to work, the Ontario Government said it didn't matter how just the cause was, it didn't matter what the issue was, that they had broken the agreement and they had to go back to work and they ended up putting Grace Hartman in jail for the very kind of behaviour that the Leader of the Opposition has been exhibiting in terms of not ordering his caucus back to work in the service of this House.

I think that their behaviour, based on this motion of privilege and why we have this motion of privilege to limit the bell ringing and this irresponsible walking out whenever they don't get their own way can only be determined as a wildcat strike, that their Leader should order their caucus back to the service of the House and should not put up with these shenanigans any longer. I think that there is no question that there has been a breach of privilege of this House in terms of their behaviour.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, J. WALDING: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to take up my opportunity to participate in this very important debate. It is very important because of the issue which it addresses and that is the issue of continued free debate, continued free participation in the parliamentary process that we have inherited and which presumably most of us here would like to defend and preserve. I hope, Mr. Speaker, to be able to make my contribution to the arguments that attempt to illustrate the unacceptability of the motion before us.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, to be able to contribute to the case being made by my colleagues and by others of independent political persuasion in this House that this motion is unfair and unreasonable, Sir; that it is particularly unfair in the context of our parliamentary traditions to which I have referred, those traditions of representative government and free democratic debate. I hope to help make the case, if I can, Mr. Speaker, why the motion before us should be defeated.

I made some reference earlier today in question period and intend to make it at greater length and

greater extent in this debate to revisionist history and the practice of revisionist history and the unfortunate penchant that the First Minister of this province has demonstrated and many of his colleagues have demonstrated and many of his sycophants in this public debate have demonstrated for presenting their own versions of Manitoba history, for practising revisionist history, and there is no other term for it.

But before I come to that, Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference to revisionist history in the making, revisionist history in the reporting, and at that level, Sir, I pick up on some of the well-placed, well-considered comments that I believe had been made in the past few minutes in this Chamber by the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

I think that one of the most unfortunate, one of the most tragic by-products of this whole convulsive experience, through which we in this Chamber have been put and through which Manitobans have been put as a consequence of the government's ill-considered initiative of last June, one of the most tragic and unfortunate by-products has been the fall-out in terms of misrepresentation of Manitoba and Manitoban's positions abroad in the land, in other parts of this country - the distortion of the inherent good nature and good will and cordiality of the Manitoba spirit, the misrepresentation of the attitude, temperament and the nature of the average Manitoba man and woman.

In media reports of this episode in this debate in other parts of this country has been profoundly unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. It has been profoundly unfair, shallow and superficial. Unfortunately it has been disseminated, unfortunately it has been distributed, through the media in Eastern Canada and in some parts of far Western Canada, and as a consequence a number of Canadians have been given the entirely wrong impression not only of this debate and this issue but far more importantly, Sir, the entirely wrong impression of Manitobans and the spirit and the nature and the good will of Manitobans across the mosaic of our cultural, linguistic and ethnic society.

That to me, Sir, is one of the most tragic consequences of this whole chapter in our history and, as a consequence, one of the most tragic results of the ill-starred, ill-fated initiatives of that government across the way. It is something that they did not consider.

Perhaps it would take the wisdom of Solomon to have anticipated it and to have considered it, but I must say, Sir, that there were many on this side who did anticipate it, did consider it and tried, and have consistently tried to warn members opposite, members of the government, that in proceeding in this area, so given to misrepresentation and misunderstanding, so given to emotionalism and exploitation, so given to misrepresentation by mischief-makers inside and outside of the province and particularly outside of the province. We must move very slowly, very carefully. We must move very cautiously. We must evolve to a position in this society of ours which is the aim and objective of all of us in Manitoba, and that is a society of good will and understanding right across our ethnic and linguistic mosaic.

We want to offer the opportunity and the environment here, Sir, for the greatest expression of cultural backgrounds and the greatest expression of individual

heritage. To do that, we were evolving and we must evolve and we must practice evolution in a careful, reasonable, sensible way. To attempt to influence that course of action, to weigh the equation unfairly on behalf of or against one particular group or another, or to move precipitously is to invite misunderstanding and, as a consequence, misrepresentation and disaster. Sir. To attempt to do it by revolution, as it were, rather than evolution is inviting disaster.

That is what has happened in this particular situation. That has been always the germ, the seed of difficulty and of danger in the government's course of action. We have tried to point that out. Many other Manitobans of good will outside this Chamber have tried to point that out, but the government of the day, the government opposite has not listened. They have pushed ahead ill-advisedly with this precipitous course of action, and now we are being misreported and misrepresented in other parts of this land. That's one of the great tragedies for me.

I was interested to hear the comments and the expression of concern voiced a few moments ago in this regard by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, because I share that concern. I too, like him and like many in this Chamber, have heard and read commentaries from Eastern Canadian media persons which totally misrepresent the issue, the debate, the subject and the nature of Manitobans and the nature of the discussion that has occupied us so intensely for the past eight months in this province.

I have heard references to anti-French rhetoric. Mr. Speaker, that to me is a totally specious, totally dishonest report or representation of what is happening and has been happening in Manitoba in the past eight months. I've heard those references, not from the media here in Manitoba I must say, but I've heard those references from the media in Eastern Canada, and particularly on commentaries on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Radio network, references to anti-French rhetoric.

What anti-French rhetoric have you heard, have I heard, has anyone in this Chamber heard since the inception of this debate, Mr. Speaker? There certainly has been anti-NDP rhetoric. There certainly has been anti-Progressive Conservative rhetoric. There certainly has been anti-closure rhetoric, but I have heard no anti-French rhetoric. I would disdain and dismiss and repudiate it if I heard it. I challenge members opposite to show me where that is different, where that case is not so, where it is otherwise. I have not heard any anti-French rhetoric.

There has been a great deal of rhetoric against what the government is trying to do. There has been a great deal of rhetoric against what the opposition has done in terms of attempting to permit free debate to occur by resisting the closure motion and by ringing the bells. I agree, but that is not anti-French rhetoric. To have it reported as such in Eastern Canada and across the nation by Eastern Canadian commentators who have access to national avenues of media is a travesty and little short of a crime, Mr. Speaker.

I share the concerns of the honourable member who just spoke in that area. This has troubled me grievously, and I would hope that those persons in Quebec and Ontario and British Columbia, in particular, those three provinces in particular, who either work in the media

in those three provinces or, by virtue of their positions, have access to the media in order to offer comments and commentary and editorial opinion in those three provinces take a little more care and engage in a little more investigation of Manitoba and Manitobans and what is happening in Manitoba, and engage in a little more study of the history and the roots of this question in Manitoba, and engage in a little more conscientious study of The Manitoba Act of 1870 before they embark on these flights of hyperbole which represent, unfortunately, much more than just a superficial approach, much more than just a brushoff of our situation and our debate here, Sir.

Unfortunately, they represent a dishonest distortion which, as I say, verges on the criminal. It's so unfair and so incorrect and so distorted that it verges on the criminal. It damages the fibre and the fabric of this nation, that kind of distorted reporting. If those commentators would take the time and trouble to study the issue and study the history of this province and study Manitobans and study The Manitoba Act of 1870, they could not possibly come to the kind of one-sided conclusions to which they have come and which they are unfairly distributing and disseminating across this nation.

One can't help but conclude, Sir, that some of them are simply looking for a sensational story. Some of them are simply looking for a whipping boy. Some of them, because they can't get any action in their provinces, in Quebec or Ontario or wherever, on this subject or subjects to which they may have some particular emotional attachment, are determined to do as much as they can to foment major stories and issues for themselves in this distant Province of Manitoba, where they don't have to answer for their reports.

So I don't want to dwell any longer on that point, Mr. Speaker, but it has been bothering me, and it has been a point which I have wished to make vis-a-vis this debate.

Now that leads me into the whole question of revisionist history, Mr. Speaker, and that case I've been attempting to make is a case of revisionist history in the making, revisionist history in the reporting. But I want to deal for a moment with the kind of revisionist history that I believe has been practised on this subject here by the First Minister and many of his colleagues.

They have, Sir, attempted over and over again to argue that this issue is one of a restoration of rights, completely ignoring the fact, deliberately ignoring the fact that what rights were unfortunately and certainly unacceptably taken away in 1890 were restored by the Supreme Court decision of 1979 and further reinforced by the implementation of legislative practices inaugurated by the previous government of this province, the Sterling Lyon Government, to implement the effects and the impact of that Supreme Court decision. Those rights were taken away in 1890. Nobody has denied that; nobody within earshot on this side of the House, to my knowledge, has denied that, but to argue, as has been argued over and over again, by the First Minister and some of his colleagues over there - those who have taken their courage in their hands and addressed this subject at all and many of those persons whom I call sycophants in the argument being advanced by the government, including some academics who should know better - have tried to insist

over and over again, Sir, that this is a case of a restoration of rights. That, Sir, is historically, factually and actually wrong.

I have read Letters to the Editor in newspaper in this city and elsewhere, but particularly in this city, that have stated in bald-faced terms that that is the case, that Manitoba was created a bilingual province, that Manitoba was created with official recognition of English and French as the official languages of the province, and that what is being taken now by the Government of the Day is an initiative aimed at restoring rights to the Francophone community, the Francophone minority. I've seen that in bald bold type, unashamedly, unabashedly put forward by sycophants of the government's position in Letters to the Editor, Mr. Speaker, and that is historically, actually and factually dishonest. It is not correct.

The First Minister has done nothing to repudiate that dishonest, incorrect representation of history or misrepresentation of history. He has in fact in numerous public utterances, either deliberately or inadvertently, reinforced that misconception in the minds of many Manitobans. Sir, that's what I call revisionist history, because that is not the accurate historical reflection of Manitoba, of The Manitoba Act of 1870, of the situation vis-a-vis Anglophones and Francophones, and the English language and the French language in Manitoba, nor of the issue that's in front of us today with respect to Francophone rights. Manitoba was not created a bilingual province recognizing English and French as official languages of the province. All one has to do is read Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to understand that.

Manitoba's Francophone community was indeed unfairly, unacceptably, reprehensibly, deprived of its rights in 1890 but those rights were restored, as I have said, by the Supreme Court decision of 1979 and the implementation of that decision by our government in the months and years immediately following that, and to argue that this initiative being undertaken by the government now represents a restoration of rights, is an attempt, Sir, perhaps inadvertent - but I can't resist the temptation to suggest that it is deliberate - an attempt to mislead the people of Manitoba. It's an attempt to misrepresent, to revise history. That, Sir, is unacceptable in the context of the profound importance of the institution that we serve, of the rights and freedoms that we serve, and of the subject that is at issue, namely an amendment to our Constitution, our Provincial Constitution and our Federal Constitution.

So, Sir, my plea at this juncture, above most others, having most other pleas to which I subscribe and which I make with respect to this debate, is above all, can we deal with this thing honestly and not be subjected, either to revisionist history being practised by the First Minister and some of his colleagues in this province, or to revisionist history in the making being attempted by various media commentators and various other observers making their views known to the media in other parts of Canada, particularly in Eastern Canada. If we can get away from that revisionism and that distortion and that misrepresentation and get back to historical fact and accuracy and truth, perhaps there can be a flowering, a resurrection of good will, on the parts of all involved in and associated with this issue in this debate, and perhaps that good will can lead to

the kind of cordial solution that I believe we all desire and certainly would serve the best interests of Manitobans generally.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of this situation on which I think the First Minister should be called to account is his public statement the other day that the debate that's taking place at the present time, the special and particular episode that's occurring in the Legislature at the present time, represents a rather "significant cost" to the taxpayers of Manitoba and an unnecessary cost at that. I gather the First Minister was rather unhappy that when he sent his researchers out to evaluate the costs of this particular extension of the Session, they came up with a figure that was not as high as he would have liked. I think they suggested that at the present time this whole operation is costing \$5,500 per day and the First Minister expressed some dismay over the fact that it was that low. He had hoped they would come in with a figure much higher, however he was finally persuaded to settle for the \$5,500 figure, and on the strength of that, in the course of some other remarks and a public statement and press conference the other day, he deplored that cost or that expense to the taxpayers of Manitoba and said, Sir, that it was the fault of the position taken by the opposition and the bell ringing that's been going on and the general impasse that's been created by the opposition's "obstructionism" in this matter. Sir, that again is a total misrepresentation of the situation and I would hope that we could expect from the First Minister a little more directness and candor related to fact in future statements, in future press conferences, and future public observations of his, throughout the remainder of this debate.

The fact of the matter, Sir, is that we wouldn't be in here, we wouldn't be locked in this current impasse, we wouldn't have been going through this past one month and more of difficult debate and dispute, if the government had acceded to the original request we made at the beginning of this whole chapter of our history last summer, when we asked that the matter be referred to a Committee of the House for intersessional study, which committee should report back to the next Session of the Legislature.

The only reason we're in here in this particular impasse at the present time, the only reason that there's some cost that the First Minister deplores, occurring at the rate of some \$5,500 a day at the present time, is that that government, Sir, and that First Minister insisted that this issue and this subject come back to the Second Session - I believe that's correct - to the Second Session of the 32nd Manitoba Legislature. In other words, the current Session, the Session that got under way, in fact, in late 1982 and represented really the 1983 Session, consumed much of 1983. Now we're back in in 1984 in that same Session.

Normally, Sir, I don't need to tell you, none of us would be sitting in this Legislature, nor you nor any of us at this time of the year. The 57 members of this House would be attending to their other legislative responsibilities and in February or March the government would bring the Legislature into Session for a new Session, new Throne Speech and a new annual chapter of legislative responsibility.

At that point in time, we could see the study of that particular government resolution on the constitutional

amendment, the extension and entrenchment of French language services having cleared a series of intersessional public hearings before a committee of the House, as it did, and then going through a period and process of evaluation, and then coming back in the form of a report. The report would have been made to that Session of the Legislature, in other words, the next Session, the '84 Session still to be called, and we would have been dealing with it after the House had been called in and after we'd gone through the Throne Speech and after we'd got settled into that new Session. We wouldn't be sitting here.

So if the First Minister is concerned about spending \$5,500 a day - and I think that it can be argued in this day and age certainly that if one doesn't have to spend \$5,500 a day of the taxpayers' money, then one should not be doing so. But I think it can be argued in the converse that on an issue such as this, Sir, that the expenditure of money reflects the reasons why the Legislature is there. An expenditure of money can certainly be justified when it's expended on pursuing the most essential and profound individual rights of a citizen and of a province's electorate, but if the First Minister is unhappy with it, he only has himself to blame.

He didn't need to spend \$5,500 a day by having us sit in here, debating this issue in January of 1984. We recommended, we proposed, we urged, we argued at length and as emphatically and as strenuously as possible last May, June, July and August that that resolution go to a committee that would report back to the next Session of the Legislature. So let us address these issues in honesty as we pursue this very important debate for Manitobans.

No one is served, neither the province nor the issue, nor the opposition, nor the government, by having the First Minister or anyone else attempt to turn and shape events and facts to suit his or her own particular needs or his or her own particular argument. No one is served by having the First Minister or anyone else attempt to sculpt arguments and sculpt events in such a way as to hide the truth or somehow dissemble the truth and create another impression among the citizens of Manitoba.

On these subjects that I have been dealing with in the last few minutes, the matter of the facts of history and the acts of history and the matter of the current extension of the 1982 Session of the Legislature sitting here in January of 1984 and the cost attached to it, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, through you to colleagues in this Chamber, and to all members opposite in particular, that the First Minister has been less than straightforward, he has been less than candid. I call upon him, on behalf of my colleagues and all Manitobans, to be candid, to be straightforward and to be truthful from here on in this debate, else we'll never achieve the opportunity to create an atmosphere that will produce a solution here. We'll never achieve the necessary environment of good will that will serve Manitobans properly.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of spokesmen on behalf of the government, both inside and outside this Chamber, who have deplored the whole subject of bell ringing and the opposition's use of that technique to keep this debate alive sufficiently to have the truth emerge and to have Manitobans become acquainted with the facts so that a responsible and knowledgeable

decision can be made on this subject. Really, Sir, it's that issue of bell ringing which is at the centre of the motion currently before us. In the moments that are available left to me in this debate, I would like to deal, among other subjects, with that subject.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is destructive of democracy, in my view, to attempt to make the case that bell ringing in a condition, in a situation, such as the present one is neither legitimate nor acceptable parliamentary procedure.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrupt the speaker on a matter of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Last August, August the 12th, the two House Leaders of this Chamber entered into an agreement, that they both affixed their signatures to, that set out the conditions under which we would run this House after the summer recess. There were seven specific conditions to that agreement, the seventh one being that regular sitting hours after recess except that there will be no Private Members' Hour.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as that, on this very issue that is currently before the House and being debated, blatantly contravenes the condition No. 6 of this same agreement, which is the one that deals with the provision of the bell ringing and, of course, the motion of privilege before us is a very serious restriction of that agreement honourably entered into and signed by the two House Leaders on August 12th, in my judgment, contravenes this agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must now inform you, Sir, that we are not prepared to allow government business to proceed and/or intrude on Private Members' Hour. I appreciate, Sir, that you of course were not in any way party to this agreement. This was an understanding, a gentlemen's understanding if you like, between how we should conduct ourselves when we resumed our Session after the recess, but inasmuch that agreement has been broken, I do humbly suggest to you, Sir, that you have no other recourse but to resume the normal sitting hours and conditions of this House, and that you should proceed with the calling of Private Members' Hour at this time. Should there be no disposition on the part of members who participate in Private Members' Hour, that then an adjournment of the House would be appropriate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the logic of the position taken by the Member for Lakeside and with regard to the agreement of last August, I agree with him. Sir, that since the opposition has reached that agreement and since they view the agreement as now having been breached, we, on this side, are prepared to entertain his suggestion that that agreement has been breached and is no longer valid and we will consider it as such

for purposes of the matter of privilege, which is currently under debate and with regard to the whole question of bell ringing.

Mr. Speaker, however, with regard to the matter of government business and the taking of precedence, Sir, even if there never was an agreement and at the wish of the Opposition House Leader to abrogate and consider that agreement null and void, we, Sir, will agree to that and accept that suggestion and will so consider it.

But, Sir, with regard to the matter of precedence, I would point out to you, Sir, that on Thursday, August 18th, Page 654 of Votes and Proceedings, which will become the Journals of this Session, by leave, on the motion of Mr. Penner, and I quote, Sir, "ordered that the Speed-up resolution agreed to by the House on July 25, 1983 be rescinded and that government business take precedence over all other business of the House." Sir, that is the motion. If the honourable member wishes to rescind that motion, he can by way of notice place such a motion to return to our normal forms of proceeding in this Chamber, but at the present time we have by unanimous consent, I point out, Sir, agreed, not only to rescind the Speed-up motion but agreed by motion of this House, not by an agreement between House Leaders, but by motion of this House agreed unanimously to provide for waiver of Private Members' Hour to provide for the precedence of government business. Sir, until this House decides otherwise, all members are bound by that motion and by that unanimous agreement which, I point out, Mr. Speaker, was moved by leave.

Now, I respect the wish and, we, on this side, accept with grace the suggestion by the Honourable Opposition House Leader that the agreement has been abrogated and no longer stands and is not binding on either party. We, Sir, since he has requested that, will agree to it, but, Sir, we are not prepared to unilaterally provide for the return to the forms of proceeding when the House by leave unanimously, without notice, agreed to the rescinding of Speed-up and government business to take precedence.

However, if the honourable member, Sir, wishes to grant leave now, we are prepared at the normal hour of adjournment, 12:30 today, to vote unanimously for the rescission of that motion of August 18th and return Monday morning to the Speed-up and to the condition of precedence for government business, both of which were dealt with in that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it concerns me to have to rise on this point of order, Sir, having been one of the people who entered into this agreement with the then Government House Leader last August, because, when I entered into that agreement, Sir, and placed my signature upon this agreement and had the signature of the Attorney-General placed upon that agreement, I thought that was a covenant that would not be broken. When the Government House Leader says that the motion to rescind Speed-up and to give precedence to government business was introduced by leave, indeed it was, Sir. It was introduced by leave based

upon an agreement signed by the Attorney-General, the chief law enforcement officer of this province, Sir. The chief law enforcement officer of this province signed this agreement and we therefore gave leave for that motion to be introduced, Sir.

The government has now abrogated this agreement by introducing the very motion which is before us, the motion to limit bell ringing to two hours after the Attorney-General had affixed his signature to an agreement that put a two-hour limit on it, Sir. And, although the motion was introduced and passed, based upon this agreement, which has now been abrogated, it does not say, Sir, that there must be business conducted during Private Members' Hour. It says that government business will have precedence, Sir, but not that there be no Private Members' Hour.

What we're saying, Sir, at this point, is that because there was unanimous agreement before and that has now been taken away by the government, we are not prepared to discuss government business during that period allotted for Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, if there was some objection to discussing government business during Private Members' Hour, that should have been raised on January 5th, Sir. We have discussed and we have interpreted the motion passed unanimously, by leave, by this House on August 18th since January 5th as including Private Members' Hour. It was clearly the intent that the House would sit normal sitting hours, Sir; that the House would sit normal sitting hours, that was the intent, that's what was discussed, that is what we have been sitting and that has included government business taking precedence over all other business during normal sitting hours. That was the discussion, Sir. Those are the sitting hours established in our rules and those are the sitting hours we are observing.

Further, Mr. Speaker, there is no suggestion and I reject the suggestion that there is any claim by the Member for Turtle Mountain or by the Opposition House Leader, who wishes to abrogate the agreement and consider it null and void, and we've said we're prepared to accept that, but regardless, Mr. Speaker, since they've made that request and we've accepted, and I'll set that aside, the important point is that the agreement, if honourable members wanted it to be binding on this House and, Sir, on you as the Speaker of this House, should have asked that it be incorporated into a motion. Okay.

The agreement was a gentleman's agreement between the two House Leaders and I believe as such has been respected by both sides, to date.

MR. H. ENNS: What's on the Order Paper? What's on the Order Paper, Andy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I said it has been respected up to this time. The desire of members opposite to consider it null and void we've accepted, but I wish to address the point. Mr. Speaker, Rules of

the House apply. The Rules of the House provide that when members on either side are guilty of obstruction and an abuse of the Rules of the House, which is what the Speaker ruled on Wednesday was happening, that by the Rules of the House matters could be dealt with.

No. 6, Rules of the House apply. The Rules of the House provide that when there is a matter of privilege, that matter can be raised and addressed. Mr. Speaker, the government was forced by the irresponsible behaviour of the opposition to bring in the motion it did and for them to now claim that in some way the House is bound by something which was intended as a gentleman's agreement, and we believe we've observed to the letter, is irresponsible, Sir, and is certainly not a point of order because it is not even before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: To the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is regrettable to have to witness the difference between what agreements, what undertakings mean between the two sides of this Chamber.

Sir, I have no difficulty in accepting and following an agreement that my then House Leader entered into. It is obvious that this House Leader can't say the same for the Attorney-General that entered into that agreement with the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. I suggest to you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that this little debate is taking place in the absence of the Attorney-General because whatever I may wish to think of him and his politics, from time to time, I do believe his integrity is being questioned by the Government House Leader at this moment because, Sir, that unanimous leave to pass the motion that the Honourable Government House Leader has referred to, and correctly referred to and read into the letter, was based and agreed to unanimously because of the agreement between two honourable gentlemen that put their signatures to it. And that set out clearly the conditions under which we would operate when we returned from our summer recess.

Mr. Speaker, the final point still being the agreement was abrogated in its most blatant form by honourable members opposite, not by this side, by the introduction of the motion that is now before us. That is an abrogation of the agreement that was signed into by the Attorney-General and by the Member for Turtle Mountain.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply suggest to you, Sir, that obviously a gentleman's agreement has broken down with respect to the introduction of this issue into this Chamber that clearly contravenes condition No. 6 of that agreement that sets out that on any one issue the time limitation for bell ringing is two weeks. — (Interjection) — And, Mr. Speaker, we are now debating an issue before us introduced by this Government House Leader, a contravention of that agreement that says bell ringing can only take place for two hours.

Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances I appeal to you to reconsider the imposition on us, under those circumstances, to have to carry on government business on Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, we on this side believe, and I am sure the Attorney-General as well subscribes wholeheartedly to the belief that we have respected this agreement; and very simply, Sir, that the motion the honourable member is attempting to rescind can only be brought in in accordance with the proper rules of this House, that we are prepared to grant leave to provide for the rescission of that motion and the returning into Speed-up of this Legislature, if that's what honourable members want. If they want to do so we, Sir, could pass that before 12:30 - or 1:30 today and sit tomorrow.

But, Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite cannot have it both ways - with the exception of the Member for Sturgeon Creek - no one, but the Member for Sturgeon Creek can have it both ways. We submit, Sir, that the Rules of the House apply, the abuse of those rules forced the matter of privilege into this Chamber which has been raised, and if honourable members don't like that, Sir, then their duty is to respect the rules and then they would find that the respect that they have not shown for this agreement would never have created this problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, they abuse the Rules of the House, even though the Member for Turtle Mountain - by your decision, Sir, they abused the rules of this House - even though the Member for Turtle Mountain signed his name to a document saying he would not do so. Mr. Speaker, I can only say, shame on the integrity of members who would do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The argument has been somewhat irrelevant. Our Rule 3 requires an adjournment hour on a Friday afternoon of 5:30. — (Interjection) — Order please. If members will look on the Order Paper they will find that the matter before the House is a matter of privilege. A matter of privilege takes precedence over other items whether or not there is a Private Members' Hour. — (Interjection) — Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has 10 minutes remaining.

MR. L. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Before I resume my remarks I would ask for the opportunity for my Deputy House Leader, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, to rise on a point of order, and I would ask that he be given that opportunity.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order before the House.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has suggested, in the comments that he has just made, that this side of the House has abused the rules of this House. That is absolutely . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order. Order please. The point of order that was raised by the Member for Lakeside and commented on by other members is not a valid point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest amount of respect I challenge that ruling from this chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be upheld? Those in favour please say, aye. Those opposed please say, nay. In my opinion the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

MR. H. ENNS: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski.

NAYS

Banman, Blake, Brown, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the member's point of order affect the vote that is now in place?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Gourlay's name was called, I don't think he is here.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas 29; Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried with the correction as noted.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has 10 minutes remaining.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the time remaining to me I want to make several points and I will attempt to make them all briefly and succinctly.

The first has to do with the issue of bell ringing itself and that, of course, has been the subject of considerable criticism where my colleagues and I have been concerned, and considerable misunderstanding, and I ask the question, Mr. Speaker - and I don't merely ask it rhetorically - I ask the question whether it is not a legitimate and an acceptable parliamentary tactic to employ the use of the ringing of the bells when that is the final weapon available in a civilized society, and a civilized parliamentary democracy, to prevent autocratic action by a government bent on forcing through, in an authoritative manner, a profound change

for society. Is bell ringing not a legitimate and acceptable weapon? We have not rung the bells other than on an issue that we feel is totally contrary to the best interests, not only of Manitoba, but Canadians; totally contrary to the best interests of the parliamentary system; that is, closure on a constitutional amendment.

If that, Sir, is not an issue that strikes at the very heart and the very soul of the parliamentary democratic process; if that, Sir, is not an issue that goes to the very soul and the very heart of freedom and democracy and our traditions in this Chamber and in Parliament generally, then I don't know what is. Closure is that issue at the heart of the atmosphere and environment to which I've referred; closure strikes at the very freedom of individual representatives freely elected in a democracy to come into a Legislative Chamber and speak on behalf of their constituents.

Now, Sir, in the old days, of course, there were other weapons available. We hopefully, presumably, have moved beyond the use of physical weapons and physical weaponry; we, hopefully, have moved beyond such traumatic and convulsive techniques as have been used in the past in ancient times in history when men and women engaged in debates of this seriousness and this import resorted to the use of weapons and violence and even civil war. We've moved beyond that to the point where we can do it in debate through the parliamentary techniques made available to us.

But the final technique, Sir, occasionally has to be applied, occasionally it has to be invoked, and that final technique in the parliamentary process is the ringing of the bells to forestall closure on a debate of profound importance. Those bells have been rung for that reason, and that reason only, so that that government cannot shut off, abort a free expression of opinion, free debate on an issue of profound importance.

Sir, another question I want to deal with in the few minutes available to me is the question of the so-called free vote. But, before I deal with that, Sir, I want to just ask the question of members opposite whether, I believe it was, Sir Harold McMillan was not right when he said that jaw-jaw is preferable to war-war. Is that not an acceptable agreeable observation where members of the government are concerned? What is wrong with debate? What is wrong with free extended examination of opinion and feelings on issues so basic as this?

Sir, on the question of a free vote, it was interesting to see the way the government members left, I might say like a jackal on a carcass, on my Leader's suggestion that this whole exercise and episode of such deep importance to us all should result in a free vote, should result in a free vote. But how, Sir, can you have a free vote in the true meaning of the word unless you have a free debate.

The reason the government benches and the First Minister left at that suggestion was because they want a vote of any kind, knowing that it won't be free on their side; knowing that they have the numbers. They want a vote of any kind just to get the issue behind them to stop the bleeding, to stop the hemorrhage. And what we have asked for, Mr. Speaker, and what is implicit in the question of my Leader is a free debate. We would like to see those silent back benches, those back benches from which has emanated a crescendo

of silence throughout this debate, Mr. Speaker - a deafening silence - spring into action and participate on this subject. That is what is implicit in the challenge thrown out by my Leader for a free vote, a free debate, a free expression and exchange of opinion among the people of this province and the constituents whom those members opposite purportedly represent; a free opportunity for their constituents to speak up and be heard; and a free response by members opposite to those concerns being expressed daily, weekly, by the hundreds, by the thousands, among their constituents where this issue is concerned, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that I agree with my House Leader who said the other day that he had never seen any party make it so hard for people to vote for them as is represented by the NDP, by the government party at the present time. My House Leader pointed out at that time that person after person, group after group, is coming forward to repudiate the NDP, former members, former executive members, former workers for that party tearing up their party cards because of their unhappiness with what that government is doing. And he said he had never seen a party make it so difficult for people to vote for them as the NDP is doing in Manitoba today.

I want to say I agree with that, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to recall a comment made by Richard Brinsley Sheridan, I believe, in the 18th Century at Westminster when he said, Sir, that he had often seen men beating their heads against a stone wall, but this was the first time he had ever seen men construct the stone wall first and then do it; and that's exactly what's happening over their, Sir.

Finally, Sir, in the one or two minutes remaining to me, I want to deal with an illusion or a false impression under which some members on the Treasury Benches may be operating. I read in The Winnipeg Sun today, Mr. Speaker, that the government is expecting to be able, perhaps, or hoping to be able to put some pressure on the Deputy Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, namely the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, namely the member now on his feet, Sir, in the event of a free vote on this issue and persuade him to support its initiative because of the position that my federal party has taken on this matter and because of my declared interest in a federal nomination for my party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the brief seconds remaining to me, I want to put an end to that conjecture at this moment. I want to ensure there is no debate and that there is no misconception and there's no agonizing on the part of my friends opposite on that subject over the weekend now in front of us. I want to assure them, Mr. Speaker, that my position . . .

HON. S. LYON: Or next weekend or the weekend after.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . or as my colleague from Charleswood says, nor next weekend or the weekend after. I want to assure them that my position on this subject is the same in a free vote, as it would be in a caucus vote. I believe that government has ripped this province asunder by their action on this matter. I believe they have proceeded totally wrongly, regardless of what may be in the hearts of many Manitobans, in terms of working towards a cordial consensus between our

linguistic and cultural groups. They have worked against that cordiality. They have proceeded in an authoritarian manner that has convulsed this province.

So, Sir, whether it's a caucus vote or a free vote, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will be voting against the government's initiative and I want them to know that, because that is what my constituents believe. That is the way my constituents feel, Sir, so I would hope there would be no misunderstanding on that part.

I stand with my Leader; I stand with my provincial colleagues; and I stand for the best interests of my country. I stand with my constituents in Fort Garry, who have made it plain to me, as their constituents across

the way have made it plain to them. The government's constituents' pleas have fallen on deaf ears, but I stand with the majority of Manitobans who have made it absolutely clear that they repudiate the authoritarian, unthinking, unseemly initiative taken by the government to create social revolution, rather than to permit social evolution.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday.